

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04437 01 OF 02 211733Z

45

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 EB-07 NSC-05 /070 W

----- 018096

R 211645Z AUG 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3182

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 5427

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4437

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MCAP, MILI, MPOL, PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: ADVANCING STANDARDIZATION IN NATO

REF: A. STATE 176498 DTG 252330Z JUL 75

B. USNATO 4223 DTC 061155Z AUG 75

C. PARIS 20959 DTG 131809Z AUG 75

D. USNATO 3936 DTG 251812Z JUL 75

SUMMARY: THIS MESSAGE SUMMARIZES OUT INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS WITH FRG DEFENSE ADVISOR (BGEN SCHUNEMANN) AND UK DELEGATION OFFICER (LEGGE) ON POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO ADVANCE STANDARDIZATION IN NATO. BOTH SCHUNEMANN AND LEGGE TENDED TO VIEW THE STANDARDIZATION ISSUE IN A EUROPEAN, VICE NATO-WIDE CONTEXT. WE THEREFORE SUPPORT AMEMB PARIS' RECOMMENDATION THAT SECRETARY SCHLESINGER DISCUSS US STANDARDIZATION OBJECTIVES WITH HIGH LEVEL FRENCH OFFICIALS DURING VISIT WE UNDERSTAND HE MAY MAKE TO PARIS IN LATE SEPTEMBER, AND WE FURTHER RECOMMEND SIMILAR DISCUSSIONS IN OTHER CAPITALS HE MAY VISIT. END SUMMARY.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04437 01 OF 02 211733Z

1. DURING RECENT CONVERSATION WITH ACTING USNATO DEFENSE ADVISOR, FRG DEFENSE ADVISOR (BGEN SCHUNEMANN) CHARACTERIZED ORIGINAL EUROGROUP PROPOSAL FOR "TWO-WAY STREET" ALONG LINES OF CALLAGHAN REPORT AS "DREAMING." HE SAID THAT SECRETARY SCHLESINGER HAD

INJECTED REALISM INTO THIS VISIONARY APPROACH BY TELLING HIS MINISTERIAL COLLEAGUES IN MAY THAT THE US WOULD BUY EUROPEAN WEAPONS ONLY IF THEY WERE COMPETITIVE IN PRICE AND EFFECTIVENESS. ACCORDING TO SCHUNEMANN, THE UK WAS PARTICULARLY DISAPPOINTED BECAUSE THEY PERCEIVED THE TWO-WAY STREET IN TERMS OF HOW IT MIGHT SUPPORT UK DEFENSE INDUSTRY. FOLLOWING THE MAY MINISTERIALS, EUROGROUP UNDERTOOK A MORE MODEST INITIAL APPROACH, ASKING FIRST "WHO WANTS TO PRODUCE WHAT?".

2. SCHUNEMANN CITED SEVERAL MAJOR CONSTRAINTS ON GREATER COOPERATION AMONG EUROPEAN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES: TO WIT, VARIOUS NATIONS HAVE A MULTITUDE OF SMALLER INDUSTRIES NOT CONDUCTIVE TO AMALGAMATION; FRANCE AND UK HAVE OVERSIZED ARMS INDUSTRIES WHICH ARE SCRAMBLING FOR CUSTOMERS; FRG AND ITALY ARE EFFECTIVE PRODUCERS BUT ONLY IN CERTAIN DEFENSE AREAS; AND SMALLER COUNTRIES ARE BOTH RELUCTANT TO ACCEPT PRODUCING ONLY ONE, OR VERY FEW, WEAPONS AND TO SACRIFICE PRESENT ARRANGEMENT WHICH ALLOWS THEM TO SHOP AROUND FOR THE BEST DEAL.

3. SCHUNEMANN DISCUSSED AT LENGTH THE ISSUE OF DIFFERENT NATIONAL MILITARY DOCTRINES WHICH LEAD TO DEVELOPMENT OF NON-STANDARD EQUIPMENT. THE UK FAVOURS A MORE STATIC EQUIPMENT OR ARMOR, TO BE USED AROUND A "FIRE POCKET" IN COMBINATION WITH FIXED MINEFIELDS AND ARTILLERY. BRITISH TANKS ARE THEREFORE VERY HEAVILY ARMORED, DESIGNED TO FIRE MORE OR LESS FROM PRE-SELECTED AREAS, AND VERY SLOW. THE FRG, ON THE OTHER HAND, FAVORS MAXIMUM MOBILITY WHICH WOULD MINIMIZE THE EFFECT OF MASSIVE SOVIET ARTILLERY AND PERMIT MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY IN OPERATIONS. THESE FACTORS ARE REFLECTED IN GERMAN TANK DESIGN WHICH IS QUITE DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF THE BRITISH. RECOGNIZING THIS PROBLEM, THE FRG AND THE UK HAVE JOINED TOGETHER IN A NEW TANK PROJECT CALLED "TANK 80" IN WHICH THEY HOPE TO DEVELOP COMMON DOCTRINE AND A SINGLE TANK DESIGN TO ACCOMMODATE THIS DOCTRINE. OTHER COUNTRIES, ESPECIALLY BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS, WANT TO GET IN ON THIS PROJECT, BUT THE UK AND FRG WILL NOT ALLOW OTHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FORMATIVE STAGE. THE REASONING IS THAT IF THE TWO COUNTRIES WITH THE MOST DIVERGENT DOCTRINES (AND THEREFORE EQUIPMENT) CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04437 01 OF 02 211733Z

CAN AGREE TO A COMMON SOLUTION, THEN THIS SOLUTION SHOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO OTHER COUNTRIES WHOSE DOCTRINES ARE SOMEWHAT IN THE MIDDLE. ACCORDING TO SCHUNEMANN, KEEPING OTHERS OUT NOW SAVES TIME IN THE LONG RUN. HE REPORTED THE UK AND FRG HAVE MADE REAL PROGRESS WHICH SHOULD LEAD TO AN EXCELLENT AND WIDELY ACCEPTED FUTURE GENERATION EUROPEAN TANK.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 04437 02 OF 02 211752Z

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EB-07 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 NSC-05 /070 W

----- 018335

R 211645Z AUG 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3183

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 5428

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4437

4. SCHUNEMANN EXPRESSED HIS BELIEF THAT, FOR MANY YEARS, THE US HAS PERCEIVED STANDARDIZATION SIMPLY TO MEAN EUROPEAN PURCHASES OF US EQUIPMENT. WHEN ASKED ABOUT POSSIBLE NATO ARRANGEMENTS TO FURTHER STANDARDIZATION, HE WAS NON-COMMITAL, SUGGESTING THAT ALL WE COULD EXPECT FROM NATO FORA WOULD BE MORE RHETORIC. HE DID, HOWEVER, SEE SOME VALUE IN A PRAGMATIC, CASE-BY-CASE APPROACH TO TRANSLANTIC STANDARDIZATION WHICH EXAMINED POSSIBILITIES FOR OFF-THE-SHELF PURCHASES, CO-PRODUCTION ARRANGEMENTS AND COOPERATION AMONG SEVERAL NATIONS DURING THE CONCEPTUAL THROUGH PROTOTYPE STAGES OF THE WEAPONS ACQUISITION PROCESS. HE SUGGESTED THAT CO-PRODUCTION ARRANGEMENTS ALSO MIGHT HELP CIRCUMVENT PROBLEMS IN THIRD COUNTRY SALES AND NOTED THAT FRANCE CURRENTLY SELLS FRENCH/FRG CO-PRODUCED EQUIPMENT TO THIRD WORLD NATIONS TO WHICH THE FRG COULD NEVER SELL. IN SOME CASES, THIS EQUIPMENT IS ACTUALLY MANUFACTURED IN THE FRG.

5. DURING RECENT INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS, UK DELEGATION OFFICER (LEGGE) EXPRESSED PERSONAL VIEW THAT MAJOR OBSTACLE TO STANDARDIZATION IS LACK OF AGREEMENT AMONG NATIONS ON TACTICAL CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04437 02 OF 02 211752Z

DOCTRINE AND CONCEPTS OF OPERATIONS. LEGGE NOTED THAT NATO HAS TALKED ABOUT STANDARDIZATION FOR YEARS WITHOUT REAL PROGRESS AND THAT UK EFFORTS IN THIS AREA ARE LARGELY CONFINED TO THE WORK OF THE EUROGROUP. HE SAW IMPROVEMENT IN STANDARDIZATION DEPENDING ON PROGRESS IN THREE AREAS: A. THE EXISTING FORCE PLANNING SYSTEM TO INCLUDE EXPANDED SPRING REVIEW, PERHAPS ALONG LINES PROPOSED BY US (REF D); B. ACTIVITIES OF CNAD AND EUROGROUP; AND C. INCREASED EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE COMMON TACTICS AND DOCTRINES AMONG ALLIES. LEGGE EXPRESSED PERSONAL SUPPORT FOR US PROPOSAL TO EXPAND SPRING REVIEW AND SAID

TWO HIGH-LEVEL MEETINGS (CHAIRER BY HOCKADAY) HAVE DEALT WITH POSSIBLE INADEQUACIES IN THE PRESENT NATO FORCE PLANNING SYSTEM AND WITH THE US PROPOSAL FOR EXPANDED SPRING REVIEW.

6. LEGGE NOTED THAT UK PLANS FOR STANDARDIZATION AND COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT/PRODUCTION OF DEFENSE EQUIPMENT CENTER AROUND THE WORK OF THE EUROGROUP. IN THIS CONNECTION, HE ECHOED THE VIEWS OF EUROGROUP SECRETARIAT JOHN LEDLIE (REPORTED PARA 5 REF B) CONCERNING FRANCE'S PARTICIPATION. APPARENTLY BELGIUM AND POSSIBLY OTHERS INSIST ON FRECH PARTICIPATION IN AN EVENTUAL EUROPEAN ARRANGEMENT, SUCH AS A "EUROPEAN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AGENCY", WHICH MAY EMERGE IN LATER STAGES OF THE EUROGROUP'S "TWO-WAY STREET" PROPOSAL. OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EUROGROUP, ESPECIALLY THE UK, HOWEVER, ARE CONCERNED THAT FRENCH PARTICIPATION MIGHT PROVE TOO COSTLY, BOTH IN TERMS OF INITIAL CONCESSIONS AND IN LATER FRENCH OBSTRUCTION TO TRANSATLANTIC AND EUROPEAN COOPERATION.

7. COMMENT: MOST OTHER ALLIES, TO VARYING DEGREES, SEEM TO SHARE THE NARROW EUROPEAN-CENTERED PERSPECTIVE ON COOPERATION IN DEFENSE EQUIPMENT AS ADVANCED BY THESE FRG AND UK OFFICIALS. AT THE SAME TIME, CONCERNS ARE APPARENTLY PANDEMIC ABOUT THE ROLE OF FRANCE IN THE COOPERATIVE FRAMEWORK THAT MAY EMERGE, AS IT WILL PERTAIN BOTH TO EUROPE AND TO BROADER, TRANS-ATLANTIC ASPECTS OF STANDARDIZATION. IN THIS CONNECTION, WE SUPPORT AMEMB PARIS' VIEW THAT FRENCH PARTICIPATION IN NATO STANDARDIZATION WILL HINGE ON DECISIONS MADE AT HIGHEST LEVELS (REF C), AND THUS ENDORSE AMEMB PARIS' RECOMMENDATION THAT SECRETARY SCHLESINGER PERSONALLY DISCUSS THE ISSUES RELATED TO STANDARDIZATION AND US GOALS IN THIS SPHERE WITH HIGH-LEVEL FRENCH OFFICIALS DURING HIS POSSIBLE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04437 02 OF 02 211752Z

VISIT TO PARIS IN LATE SEPTEMBER. WE ALSO RECOMMEND SIMILAR DISCUSSIONS IN OTHER ALLIED CAPITALS HE MAY VISIT ON THIS TRIP.  
BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 21 AUG 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO04437  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750897/abbrzlny.tel  
**Line Count:** 204  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. STATE 176498 DTG 252330Z JUL 75 B. USNATO 4223 DTC 061155Z AUG 75 C. PARIS 20959 DTG 131809Z AUG 75 D. USNATO 3936 DTG 251812Z JUL 75  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 30 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <30 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <01 MAY 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** ADVANCING STANDARDIZATION IN NATO  
**TAGS:** MCAP, MILI, MPOL, PFOR, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006